

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vinginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,179	12/13/2000	Tahir Sadik Khan	LIFE-016	8410
75	90 06/19/2003			
Bret Field Bozicevic, Field & Francis LLP Suite 200 200 Middlefield Road Menlo Park, CA 94025			EXAMINER	
			. ALEXANDER, LYLE	
			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1743 DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003	12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Anniesties No	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/737,179	KHAN ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Lyle A Alexander	1743
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence address
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a represent of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however,  bely within the statutory minimur  d will apply and will expire SIX of the cause the application to be	may a reply be timely filed  n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	<u> 3 April 2003</u> .	
2a)	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠	This action is non-final	
3)☐ Disposit	Since this application is in condition for allocalosed in accordance with the practice under the condition of Claims	wance except for form er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 19	al matters, prosecution as to the merits is 35 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
<b>4</b> )⊠	Claim(s) 1-7,9-11,13,14,16,19-21 and 23-27	is/are pending in the	application.
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	awn from consideration	n.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-7,9-11,13,14,16,19-21 and 23-27	is/are rejected.	
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requireme	nt.
Applicat	ion Papers	•	
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected t	by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to		• •
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved t	) disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in	reply to this Office action	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Pri rity (	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been receive	d
	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been receive	d in Application No
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2	(a)).
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	•	
a	) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	rovisional application l	nas been received.
Attachmen		. ,	<b>30</b>
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Not	rview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) er:
S. Patent and To TO-326 (Re		Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 12

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

## Claim R jections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer in view of either Henschen et al. or Gargan.

Kloepfer teaches making a blood test strip that can detect glucose (see col. 11 line 44). Figure 11 demonstrates how the test strips are cut out of a precursor comprising an elongated support material. Kloepfer is silent to the claimed interdigitating pattern of the precursor on the test strip.

Henschen et al. teaches in column 9 lines 4+ that two interdigitated rows of electrodes are advantageous because it save the amount of metal required when compared to a single row of terminals.

Gargan teaches in column 4 lines 10+ teach a stamped interdigitating pattern takes up less material because less material is wasted and therefore would have a lower production cost.

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan and use an interdigitating pattern when outlining the test devices on the precursor to gain the above advantages of requiring less material and a lower production cost.

The modified method of Kloepfer is silent to the claimed aspect ratio of 0.5 and a lance.

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

The court decided <u>In re Boesch</u> 205 USPQ 215 that optimization of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. A result effective variable is one that has predictable and well-known results. The relative dimension of the test device are a result effective variable based upon the desired application and marketing requirements. Also, the use of a standard solution and a lance for drawing a blood sample are result effective variable having the expected and well known function of providing standardization and drawing blood.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Kloepfer to have a sample application region with an aspect ratio of 0.5 as optimization of a result effective variable based upon the desired application and marketing specifications. Additionally, one would further modify Kloepfer and supply a standard solution and lance to gain the advantage of having means to standardize and draw a blood sample as optimization of a result effective variable.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan as applied to claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21,23 and 25-27 above, and further in view of Garcia et al.

Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan is silent to the claimed lance.

Garcia et al. teach it is desirable to supply a lance with a blood test kit so that a sample can be safely and comfortly drawn.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Kloepfer in view of Garcia et al. and supply a lance to gain the above advantages.

Art Unit: 1743

## R spons to Argum nts

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21 and 23-27 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 703-308-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9319 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

\*\*\*

June 16, 2003